

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/084,712	02/25/2002	Lalitha Agnihotri	US020056	5878	
24737 PHILIPS INTE	7590 04/26/2007 ELLECTUAL PROPERTY	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			NGUYEN BA,	NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2623		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/26/2007	PAPÉR	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/084,712	AGNIHOTRI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	2623	

	Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	2623			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 26 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.			
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	affidavit, or other evider n compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I</li> </ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for ater than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejecti	on.		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amou shortened statutory period for reply or r than three months after the mailing o	nt of the fee. The appropri iginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as		
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of th			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see N		ecause		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	• •	reducing or simplifying	the issues for		
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ejected claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>		•	,		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate	e, timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		will be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,8,9,11,13-17,20 and 21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app	eal and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attack	ned.		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:		
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>			•		
13. \( \text{Other: } \frac{See Continuation Sheet}{\text{See Continuation Sheet}} \)  Hoang-Vu Antony Nguyen-Ba Primary Examiner					
	ANTONY NGUYEN-BA	Hoang-Vu Antony I Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2623	nguyen-Ba		

PRIMARY EXAMINER

## Continuation of 13. Other:

- 1. Objection to Claims 9 and 20 withdrawn;
- 2. 112/2nd rejection of Claims 16, 1 and 20 withdrawn;
- 3. 103a rejection of Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-16 as unpatentable over Ward III in view of Ahmad:
  - a. Claims 11 and 13-16 are included in the the rejection as set forth at pages 11-12;
- b. in response to Applicants' argument that the Office action appears to overlook the fact that Applicant's first argument focused on the recitation in claim 1 of "summaries" but instead, focuses on the definition of an episode, the examiner respectfully notes the following:
- the Office action does mention at the bottom of p. 8 that, in an analogous art, ahmad discloses news summaries of different episodes (e.g., Insurer's Eye Erin's Cost is the summary of the event or episode dated Thu, 3 Aug 95 and Erin: A Tropical Storm, another episode dated Wed, 2 Aug 95 of the same tropical Storm Erin); the claimed "Summaries of other episodes" is deemed properly addressed in the rejection and the finality of the action is considered proper;
- 4. Claims 2-5 and 8 are not deemed allowable (see above response and rejection of these claims in the previous Office action;
- 5. Claims 11 and 13-16 are not deemed alllowable (see above response and the rejection of these claims in the previous Office action);
- 6. Claim 20 is not allowable (see above response and rejection of claim 20 in the previous Office action);
- 7. Claim 21 is not allowable (see above response and the rejection set forth in the previous Office action);
- 8. 103a rejection of Claims 6 and 17 as unpatentable over Ward III in view of Ahmad and further in view of Shoff: since the rejections of claims 1 and 21 are incorporated in claims 6 and 17, respectively and since the features specifically recited in Claim 6 and 17 are addressed in the previous Office action and that the rejection of Claims 6 and 17 is traversed by Applicants without rationale, the rejection of these claims are maintained;
- Since Claim 9 recites the same feature of Claims 1 and 21, the same response as set forth above also applies to claim 9.

ANTONY NGUYEN-BA PRIMARY EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mrangur Cert

2